

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

**HERMAN TOWNSEND,**

Plaintiff,

v.

**TOMA OSMAN, et al.,**

Defendants.

)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)

Civil No. **03-237-JLF**

**ORDER**

**PROUD, Magistrate Judge:**

Before the Court are two motions to compel filed by plaintiff:

- Plaintiff's Motion to Compel (**Doc. 127**);
- Plaintiff's Motion to Compel (**Doc. 131**).

These motions concern discovery requests sent by plaintiff to various defendants. Many of the defendants filed motions for summary judgment, raising the issue of plaintiff's failure to exhaust administrative remedies. The Court ordered discovery stayed as to the counts that were the subjects of those motions. **See, Doc. 95.**

Because defendants' motions for summary judgment were granted in large part, plaintiff's discovery requests are mostly irrelevant now, as many of his claims have been dismissed. **See, 162.** In addition, there are now pending report and recommendations on other motions for summary judgment.

The Court will not expend its resources combing through plaintiff's voluminous discovery requests to weed out those that are now moot. Rather, plaintiff should review his discovery requests and the responses that he has received in order to determine which, if any,

relevant requests remain unanswered. If plaintiff feels that there are relevant requests which remain unanswered, he may file a motion to compel with regard to those requests only.

Upon consideration and for good cause shown, the following motions are **DENIED**:

- Plaintiff's Motion to Compel (**Doc. 127**);
- Plaintiff's Motion to Compel (**Doc. 131**).

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

**DATE: August 10, 2006.**

s/ Clifford J. Proud  
**CLIFFORD J. PROUD**  
**UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**